

AN INTRODUCTION TO  
VIKRAMORVASIYA  
OF KALIDASA

BY  
V. K. KOTNIS

FOREWORD BY  
Dewan Bahadur K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI, B.A., B.L.,  
(Retired District Judge)

ATIONAL PUBLISHING CO.,  
and Line Beach, Madras.

“ मृत्तिकेचें पात्र माझें तेवढी माझी कमाई ”



## AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

This book is an attempt to co-ordinate the notes that I made during my study of Sanskrit at the School of Oriental Studies, London, when I was preparing for the I. C. S. examination. The spirit, with which I am publishing it, is not that of a pedagogue out to teach to the rest of the world all that I claim to know, but that of an humble student who is willing to co-operate with and seeks equal co-operation from fellow students. In this book I have tried to include all that is of relevant interest to a student of Sanskrit drama with special reference to Vikramorvasi and I trust that nothing material is left out.

I must here admit that I have made free use of the following books, without the help of which my task would have been much more difficult: Keith's Sanskrit Drama, Wilson's Theatre of the Hindus, Horowitz's A History of Indian Literature, Adelung's A short History of Indian Literature, Sir M. William's edition of Sakuntala and the different editions of Vikramorvasi, especially those of Messrs. Pandit, Kale and Karmarker.

I am grateful to Dewan Bahadur K. S. Ramaswami Sastri for taking this book under his scholarly patronage by writing a charming foreword to it. And my thanks are also due to those of my friends who have taken a personal interest in this work and helped me to get it published.

V. K. KOTNIS.





## FOREWORD

BY

DEWAN BAHADUR K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI, B.A., B.L.

It gives me great pleasure to write this foreword and link my name with that of the author who has written an admirable introduction to Kalidasa's *Vikramorvasiya*-a play, which, though it is inferior to *Sakuntala* in the delineation of human emotions, soars far above even Kalidasa's other dramas and therefore far, far above all other Indian dramas in lyrical sweetness and in delineation of nature and especially in sheer power of poetry. In a very brief compass he has dealt with all the points connected with a critical study of Sanskrit drama in general and Kalidasa's play in particular, and has given us also an excellent aesthetic estimate of *Vikramorvasiya*. His Introduction is not only sure to prove useful to students in colleges but is also likely to have a wider appeal and a more permanent value as a contribution to Kalidasian criticism.

I am myself a habitual worshipper at Kalidasa's shrine and have published not only Kalidasa's *Heroes and Heroines* but also two big books entitled *Kalidasa : His period, personality, and Poetry*; and the *Genius of Kalidasa*. Whenever I get an opportunity to speak or write on Kalidasa I am prone to let myself go, forgetful even of the limitations of the occasion. I am afraid that Mr. Kotnis is in the position of the fisherman in Arabian Nights. The Fisherman cast his net into the sea and brought up a bottle. He opened the bottle. Smoke came out of it till it occupied the space between the earth and the sky. The smoke eventually took on the form of a genius who

threatened to eat up the fisherman till the latter refused to believe that the genius came out of the bottle and the genius got into the bottle to prove his emergence, whereupon the Fisherman promptly corked the bottle. I know that I must get back into the small bottle of this foreword.

The date of Kalidasa was and is and will be the Kurukshetra of literary history. But it is a Kurukshetra where many heroic scholars have fought and none have emerged as victors. I stick to the view that Kalidasa belonged to the era of Vikramaditya the Great and belonged to the First Century B. C. The author has given us an excellent discussion of all the materials available to-day to settle the date of the greatest classical poet of India.

The Indian scholars are today prone to feel the gravitational pull of Western Savants, who have exhibited an unconcious bias in bringing every thing great in India into the centuries after the birth of Christ, unless the logic of facts was too strong for them, and in saying that in India religion has gripped every aspect of life within its tentacles. The time is now come for us to get over the hypnotism of the West in the cultural as in the political field. Drama began its career all over the world under the aegis of religion but very soon it came of age and went away to effect its own conquests. In India also it was under *patria potestas* only for a short time. The Sanskrit drama is more akin to the Shakespearean romantic drama than to the classical drama. It was never laid on the Procrustean beds of the unities of time and place. But it voluntarily observed the unity of action. It had a powerful popular appeal in the times of Bhasa and Sudraka and Kalidasa, though later on it became a Pandit-ridden drama when Sanskrit ceased to be understood



by the people, and the learned men used drama as a field for the display of verbal and sentimental fireworks.

When the learned drama became too learned to be a vehicle of life, the popular drama became too crude and too bombastic or too farcical to be a vehicle of life. The time is now come to give a new plasticity and power to dramas in the regional tongues of India, by going for inspiration to Kalidasa and Bhavabhuti, and lifting the popular drama from its plathora of unreal sentiment and silly humour and inartistic songs into a thing of beauty and a work of art. We have to study Indian Aesthetics, which is a most refined and wonderful branch of study, albeit it is neglected today, and use its life-giving ideas without caring much for its elaborate and life-destroying rules about Vishkambhakas and Pravesakas and other abracadabra of Indian dramatic art. Even the ambit of the Rasas has to be widened and even the concept of Rasa has to be lifted from the appetite of the gourmand to the passion of a Pygmalion.

The passion of a Pygmalion! Yes. That is the keynote of Vikramorvasiya. Pygmalion was bewitched by the thing of beauty which was created by his hand. Vikrama was fascinated by vision of celestial beauty which came to him like a moonbeam through a chink in a prison wall. Tagore has captured for us that vision in his world-famous poem on *Urvashi*. Act IV of Vikramorvasiya is the high watermark of pure dramatic poetry and lets us a poet's vision of celestial loveliness—"such sights as youthful poet's dream, On summer eve by haunted stream." The poet's desire—"worthy of the inventive mind which visualised the *Abijnana* ring in Sakuntala and transformed by the magic of the ring the rough hewn granite block of the Sakuntala episode in the Mahabharata into a divine work of art of the *Sangamaniya mani*



(the precious divine gem which came from the lotus feet of the Sati of Satis and the Devi of Devis, has enabled the poet to give to the vision of celestial beauty the divine spiritual touch of a blessed reunion due to divine grace. Kalidasa performed the feats of both Timotheus and St. Cecilia and "raised a mortal to the skies" and "drew an angel down" and gave the former the divine intoxication of bewitching beauty and the realisation that to be a servant of the Queen of Loveliness is a higher destiny than being the overlord of the Earth,

सामन्तमौलिमणिरंजितपादपीठमेकातपत्रमवनेन तथा प्रभुत्वम् ।

अस्याः सखे चरणयोरहमद्यकान्तमाज्ञाकरत्वमधिगम्य यथा कृतार्थः ॥

and gave the latter, a born goddess, the evanescent and ethereal grace of an all-too-human love. He then performed another piece of magic by refining the love of both in the fire of separation (*Vipralambha Sringara*). He performed finally the divine magic of transforming the refined love into divine devotion by the touch of Devi's feet. Have we not felt a thrill at hearing the name of Urvashi? Has she not carried away our hearts with her?

एषा मनो नः प्रसभं शरीरा-

त्पितुः पदं मध्यममुत्पतन्ती ।

सुरांगना कर्पति खण्डिताग्रा—

स्त्रं मृणालादिव राजहंसी ॥

Madras.  
26th June 1939. }

K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI.

## AN INTRODUCTION TO VIKRAMORVASI

### CHAPTER I

#### THE ORIGIN OF THE DRAMA

We have every reason to believe that the Sanskrit drama has its origin in religious practices. The Mahābhāṣya gives us evidence of a stage where all the elements of drama were present. In Kaṁśavadha is seen the refined version of an older vegetation ritual in which the representative of the outworn spirit of vegetation is destroyed.

In one essential form the primitive Indian drama is quite different from the suggested origin of the Greek tragedy. Here though death occurs there is no sorrow. The fact that the Sanskrit drama insisted on a happy ending can be explained only if it be brought into connection with the fact of the origin of the drama in a passion play whose end was happiness through death, and not grief. This view is confirmed by a perusal of Bhāsa's plays. This dramatist does not conform to the rule of the later dramatic critics that there should be no slaying on the stage. But in all his dramas wherever death occurs, it is the death of the enemy of Krishna or the Gods.

Alike in the Greek and the Sanskrit dramas, the essential fact in the contest is the existence of a conflict. Only in the Greek drama in its development, this conflict came to dominate the play whereas in Sanskrit this characteristic is much less predominant. But it is distinctly present in all the higher forms of the art.



An additional evidence in support of the theory of the religious origin of the drama is to be found in the character of the Vidūṣaka, the constant and trusted companion of the King. His name indicates as one given to abuse, and very often in the dramas we find him and one of the attendants on the Queen engaged in the contest of acrid repartee, in which he certainly does not fare the better. It would be absurd to ignore in this regard the dialogue between the Brahman and the hetaera in the Mahāvrata, where the exchange of coarse abuse is intended as a fertility charm.

Another evidence of the close connection of the drama with religion is found in the legend of Kṛṣṇa whose feat of slaying Kāṁsa is carried out in amphitheatre in the presence of the public, where he defeats the wrestlers of his uncle's court and finally slays the tyrant. The festival of his nativity is essentially a popular spectacle. Kṛṣṇa again is the lover of shepherdesses and the inventor of the ardent dance of love, the Rāsakrīdā. Of great importance in this regard is the persistence in popularity of the Yātrās, which have survived the decadence of the regular S'anskrit drama. The love of Rādhā for Kṛṣṇa, who by no means, is a faithful lover, is recounted and the end always is the fruition of Rādhā's love. The Gītagovinda is a literary expression of the substance of the Yātrā with its lyric songs, to which must be added the charms of music and the dance. The normal prose language of the drama is S'auraseni Prākṛit and it is so because most probably it was the ordinary speech of the people among whom the drama first developed into definite shape.

Siva also occupies an equally important place as Kṛṣṇa in the history of the development of the drama. To him and to his wife are ascribed the invention of the Tāṇḍava and the Lāsya dances. It is not surprising, also, that a God



who in the Vedic period itself was hailed as the patron of men of every profession and occupation should be regarded as the special patron of the artistes. But his importance in the drama is later than that of Kṛṣṇa as Bhāsa, who is the oldest of all classical dramatists, celebrates Kṛṣṇa in full and is an ardent Vaiṣṇava while Śūdraka, Kālidāsa, Harsa and Bhavabhūti are the adorers of Śiva. The Mālavikāgnimitra of Kālidāsa introduces a dancing master who speaks of the creation of the dance by the God Siva, and its close connection with the drama. The sect of Pāsupatas, include in their ritual the song and the dance, the latter consisting in the expression of the sentiments of the devotees by means of corporeal movement in accord with the rules of Nāṭyasāstra. In the decadent ceremonial of the Tantras the ritual includes the representation of Śiva by men, and of his spouse as Śakti by women.

The religious importance of the drama is clearly evident from the attitude of the Buddhists towards it. The extreme dubiety of the date of the Buddhist Suttas makes it impossible to give any satisfactory decision regarding the existence of the drama at a very early age. The terms employed such as Visūkadassana, Nācca and Pekkha and the reference to the Samājjas are very obscure. The objection of the sacred canon to monks witnessing these shows whatever their nature was, is gradually overcome and it is important to note that the earliest dramas known to us by fragments are the Buddhist dramas of Aśvaghosa. The Lalitāvistāra tells us that among the accomplishments of Buddha was the knowledge of drama also. The legend admits that even in Buddha's time there were dramas as Bimbisāra had one performed to entertain two Nāga kings. The Avadānasataka places the drama in remote antiquity. The Buddhist dramas have left their mark

on the form of the *Saddharmapuñḍarīka* which is presented as a series of dialogues in which the Buddha himself is one of the interlocutors. The same love of the Buddhists for artistic effects is seen in the use of songs, music, dance and some scenic effects in ritual attaching to the foundation of the *Stūpas* in Ceylon. The frescoes of Ajanta show the keen appreciation felt for music, song and the dance, though they date from a time when the regular drama was in existence. In Tibet the relics of ancient popular religious plays are preserved in the contests between the spirits of good and evil, which form a part of the spring and autumn festivals.

The evidence for the close connection between religion and drama is thus conclusive; and it was from religion that the decisive impetus was given to the drama. The primitive vegetation ritual as that of the *Mahāvratā* developed until it assumed the concrete and human form of the *Kṛṣṇa* and *Kaṁsa* legend. The *Mahābhāṣya* shows that the story of *Kṛṣṇa* and *Kaṁsa* could both be represented by *Granthikas* who coloured their faces and expressed vividly the emotions of those whom they represented; and also in dumb show by *S'aubhikas*. If in *Patañjali's* time there did not exist any Indian drama proper, it developed shortly afterwards and the *Naṭas* of *Patañjali* were much more than dancers or acrobats.

We can therefore say without any great hesitation that the Sanskrit drama came into being shortly after the middle of the 2nd century B.C. and that it was evoked by the combination of epic recitation with the dramatic moment of the *Kṛṣṇa* legend in which a young God strives against and overcomes enemies.



## CHAPTER II

## THE TECHNIQUE OF THE DRAMA

The Sanskrit drama bears in most respect a close resemblance to the Romantic than to the Classical school. It is impossible that it was borrowed from any other people either of ancient or modern times. It presents characteristic features in its conduct and construction which plainly evinces its original design and national development.

The greater part of every play is written in Sanskrit. None of the dramatic compositions at present known can boast of a very high antiquity, and several of them are comparatively modern. They must therefore have been unintelligible to a considerable portion of their audiences and never could have been so directly addressed to the bulk of the population as to have exercised much influence upon their passion or their tastes.

This circumstance, however, is perfectly in harmony with the constitution of the then society by which the highest branches of literature as well as the highest offices in state were reserved for Brahmins and Kśatriyas only. Even amongst them only a small portion could have understood the expressions of the actors so as to have felt their full force. And therefore the plays must have been exceedingly deficient in theatrical effect. In some measure this deficiency was compensated by the popularity of most of the stories; the sanctity of the representation, as well as by the fact that the Sanskrit language substituted an adventitious interest for ordinary excitement. The occasions considered suitable for the dramatic performances were the lunar holidays; a royal coronation; assemblage of people at fairs and religious festivals; marriages;



the meetings of friends ; taking first possession of a house or town ; and the birth of a son ; etc.

Poetry in Sanskrit from the inherent nature as apart from its intrinsic merit is divided into two kinds : *Dṛṣya* what is capable of being seen, and *Śravya*, which can be only heard or chanted. The drama falls under the first division. *Rūpaka* is the general term in Sanskrit for all dramatic compositions and *Uparūpaka* comprises a subordinate class. The *Rūpaka* is divided into following ten classes according to the *Rasa* or sentiment which is the sub-stratum of the drama: (1) *Nāṭakam*, (2) *Prakaraṇa*, (3) *Bhāṇa*, (4) *Vyāyoga*, (5) *Samāvākāra*, (6) *Dīmaḥ*, (7) *Ihāmṛga* (8) *Vithī*, (9) *Añkaḥ* and (10) *Prahasana*. The *Uparūpaka* is also divided into eighteen sub-divisions: (1) *Nāṭikā*, (2) *Troṭaka*, (3) *Goṣṭhi*, (4) *Saṭṭaka*, (5) *Naṭyarasaka*, (6) *Prasthāna*, (7) *Ullāpya*, (8) *Kāvya*, (9) *Pūrkhanā*, (10) *Rāsaka*, (11) *Sanlāpaka*, (12) *Śrigaḍita*, (13) *Śilāpaka*, (14) *Vilāsikā* or *Lāsikā*, (15) *Durmālikā*, (16) *Prakarantikā* (17) *Hāllisā* and (18) *Bhāṇikā*.

Of all these sub-divisions the most important are the *Nāṭaka*, the *Prakaraṇa* and the *Troṭaka*. The *Nāṭaka* the highest kind of composition in this department of literature possesses many characteristics bearing a striking analogy to the tragedy of the Greeks. Like the Greek tragedy the *Nāṭaka* is to represent none but worthy or exalted personages. The action or more properly the passion should be but one ; as love or heroics. The plot should be simple and the incidents consistent. The business should spring direct from the story as a plant from the seed ; and should be free from episodical and prolix interruptions. The time should not be protracted nor the duration of an act, according to strict rule, exceed one day, though very often some allowance was made on this score. The *Nāṭaka* may consist of from five to ten acts. The

hero should be Dhīrodātta. The prevailing sentiment should be Śṛṅgāra or Vīra and sometimes Karuṇa.

The plot of a Prakaraṇa should be fictitious and drawn from real life in a reputable class of society. The hero must be Dhīraprasānta and may be of a ministerial rank, or a brahman or a merchant. The heroine may be a maiden of a noble family, or a courtesan. The most appropriate sentiment is Śṛṅgāra. Gamblers and other low characters should be introduced. The play should be divided into ten acts. Mālatimādhava and Mr̥cchakaṭikā belong to this class.

A Troṭaka consists of five, seven eight or nine acts. The characters to be represented should be celestial as well as human. The Vidūṣaka should take a prominent part in it and must be present in every act. The prevailing sentiment should be Śṛṅgāra.

The principal division of a play are Vāstu or plot; Neta or hero; and Rasa or sentiment. Vastu is of two kinds: Adhikārika or principal and Prāsaṅgika or accessory. The principal is that which relates to the chief characters or the persons concerned with the essential interest of the piece and pervades the whole arrangement. The accessory is that which appears in furtherance of the main topic and is concerned with the characters other than the hero or the heroine. This latter is of two kinds: Patākā and Prakarī. Patākā or banner is an episode by which the progress of the plot is illustrated, furthered or hindered, so as to give additional interest to it. It is of a considerable length and sometimes extends to the very end of a play. The Prakarī is also an episodical incident of limited duration and minor importance, one in which the principal characters take no part.

Besides these two, there are three other elements requi-



site for the development of the plot. These are Bija, the seed, Bindu the drop, and Kārya or the final issue. Bija is circumstance leading to the ultimate end briefly stated at the beginning, and which as the plot develops bears multifarious results. It is as it were the seed of the whole play. Bindu is what cements a break in the play caused by the introduction of some other incidents and Kārya is the final object, which being attained, the object of the play is over. These five are technically called Arthaprakṛtis.

The plot may either be borrowed from history; or tradition; or it may be fictitious; or it may be mixed *i.e.* partly borrowed from history and partly fictitious. In a Nāṭaka the plot should always be taken from history or tradition and in Parakaraṇa it should be fictitious.

The plot develops according to the five following conditions: Ārambha, the beginning or setting on foot of the story; Yatna effort; Prāptyāśā, the prospect of success Nityāpti, some attainment after the surmounting of obstacles; and Phalāgama, the attainment of the desired object.

The links which connect these five conditions of development with the principal and episodic parts of the action are called Sandhis, and are five in number. *viz.*, Mukha, Prati-mukha, Avamarśa, Nirvahaṇa and Upasañhṛti or Upasañhāra. The Mukhasandhi is the combination of Bija with Ārambha; *i.e.* where the seed is sown with all its rasa. In the Prati-mukha there is the means Yatna, to the chief end, as originally implied by the Bija in the Mukha, which now sprouts up. In the Garbha, we have the furtherance towards the desired object. Here though there are impediments the main plot gains ground in spite of the resistance. The Avamarśasandhi is that in which the seed attains more luxurious growth than in



the Garbha, being accompanied by Nityāpti; but the final result is put off by fresh impediments of various sorts as for example, in the Śākuntalā, the king forgets the maiden after the marriage on account of Durvāsa's curse. In the Nirvāṇa this obstacle is also surmounted and in the Urasābhāra we have the Phalāgama, or the attainment of the desired end.

The subject matter is again divided in two forms: Sūcya, or that which is only to be suggested or implied; and Dr̥ṣyaśravaṇya that which is fit to be seen and heard. The suggestion or implication of matter which is not fit for exhibition is made in one of the following ways: Viṣkambhaka, Cūlikā, Añkasya, Añkāvatāra and Pravesāka.

The Viṣkambhaka is an interlude between the acts of a drama which shows in a few words the connection between the past part of a story and what is to happen in the future. It is expressed through the conversation of minor characters. It is called Śuddha, when the characters in it speak Sanskrit; and mixed when the characters are low ones speaking Prakrit. The Viṣkambhaka in the Vikramorvaśīya is a mixed one, as though one of the characters is a Brahman and speaks Sanskrit, the other is a low one speaking Prakrit.

Cūlikā is the suggestion of something occurring behind the scenes. In the stage directions it is shown as Nepathye.

In Añkasya the characters at the end of a concluding act suggest the connection between that act and the next one which is to commence. Witness the speech of Kāmandaki and others at the end of Act III in the Mālatimādhava.

In Añkāvatāra at the beginning of a new act the connection between it and the act previous to it is announced as for example in the sixth act of Śākuntalā,

A Praveśaka or introduction is one, which being interposed between any two acts suggests like the Viśkambhaka some past or future event to show the connection between the parts of the story, through the conversation between low characters. It can never introduce the first act. According to Jagaddhāra the language of a Praveśaka should be generally Śauraseni or any other similar Prakrit and never Sanskrit.

According to the necessity of the plot the subject matter may be Sarvaśravyam or prakāsam; aśravyam or svagatam; and niyataśravyam which in turn may be Janāntikam or apavārikam. Independent of these is the Ākāśbhāṣitam.

The hero of a Sanskrit drama is required to be modest, decorous, comely, munificent, civil, of sweet address, eloquent, sprung from a noble family. Heroes are mentioned to be of four kinds: Dhīrodātta, Dhīralalita, Dhīrasānta and Dhīroddhata. The hero of sublime qualities is one who is magnanimous, not given to boasting, self-possessed, of firm resolve, whose high spirit is concealed, and who is true to his engagements. The hero may be again Dakṣiṇa or gallant, who is equally devoted to many women though principally attached to one; Sāṭha or sly, one who being attached to one lady, covertly acts in a way unpleasant to her; or he may be Dhīṣṭa bold, openly making professions to another and not ashamed of his conduct even when reproached with; and Anukūla or favourable, who is devoted to one heroine only. The Dhīrodātta hero has eight manly qualities: Śobhā, Vilāsa, Mādhurya, Gāmbhīrya, Dhairya, Tejas, Lālitya and Audārya.

Among the associates of the hero the principal is the Pīṭhamarda, who is the hero of the Patākā or the episode, clever in discourse, devoted to his master and a little inferior to him in qualities.



Next comes the Vidūṣaka, the constant companion of the hero, whose main function is to furnish repartees in wit, to help his friend in the love intrigues and otherwise assist in the general denouement of the play. He should be very fat and ugly, and fond of eating.

Next in importance to the Vidūṣaka, is the Viṭa, who knows one art only and is useful to the hero in that. He might be called the Horatio of the Sanskrit drama. There may also be ministers of state and ministers of religion, ascetics, allies, slaves, eunuchs, mutes and barbarians. Sometimes there is a rival to the hero called the Pratināyaka, who is avaricious, bold, impetuous, criminal, and of evil conduct like Sansthānaka of the Mṛcchakatikā.

The Nāyikā, or the heroine must be possessed of qualities similar to those of the hero. She may be the wife of the hero, Svīya, as Sitā in the Uttararāmacarita; or one belonging to another; Anyā or Parakīyā; or a common woman, Sāmānyā or Sādhārana Strī, as Vasantasena in the Mṛcchakatikā. The Parakīyā, so called because she is in the power of her guardian, may be a maiden or the wife of another. But the latter should never be the heroine, as that would pervert the morality of the play. The maiden love better helps in bringing out the sentiment of Sṛigāra, and hence almost all the Nāyikās are maidens.

The Nāyikā is allowed to have a Sakhi, dāsi, Dhātreyī, or Pratiśikā and others, possessing qualities corresponding to those of the attendants on the hero.

The sentiment underlying the play is denoted by the term Rasa. The feeling which completely pervades the heart by any emotion, arising out of either pleasure or pain, is called the Bhāva. Vibhāva is that which being perceived nourishes the main sentiment. It is divided into two classes—Ālambata

and Uddīpana. The former is the substratum of the Rasa in the form of the person, or thing with reference to which the sentiment arises; and the latter is that which excites or enhances the above sentiment, such as the moon, the beauty of the spring season, the beauty or the decoration of the principal characters etc., in the case of Sṛṅgāra. Anubhāva is the manifestation of the aforesaid vibhāva through the senses. The anubhāva is further divided into two classes: the Sātvikabhāva and the Vyabhicāribhāva. The former is of eight different kinds: Stambha, Praḥaya, Romāñca, Sveda, Vaivarṇya, Vepathu, Aśru and Vaivasya. The latter is not strictly confined to any rasa, but appears and disappears like the waves in an ocean, serving as feeders to the prevailing sentiment and strengthening it in different ways. The Sthāyībhāva is the main sentiment of the play and all other sentiments must be subordinate to it. In that case the main sentiment is called the Aṅgi and the subordinate ones are called the Aṅgas.

The Sthāyībhāvas are eight in number: Rati, Hāsyā, Śoka, Krodha, Utsāha, Bhaya, Jugupsā and Vismaya on which are respectively based the following eight sentiments: Sṛṅgāra, Hāsyā, Karuṇā, Raudra, Vīra, Bhayānaka, Bībhatsa and Adbhuta. The ninth sentiment Śānti is based on the Sthāyībhāva of Śānt or tranquillity: But it is not marked for dramatic purposes and rarely occurs as a main sentiment in a drama. Of these eight sentiments, Sṛṅgāra and Hāsyā; Vīra and Adbhuta; Bībhatsa and Bhayānaka; and Raudra and Karuṇa are generally paired together.

Sṛṅgāra is of two kinds: Vipralambha or love in separation and Sambhoga or love in union. The former is further divided into Ayoga, or the non-consummation of marriage, and Viprayoga, or the separation of lovers after marriage.



Every dramatic piece opens with a prelude or prologue, *Prasthāvanā*, which is itself introduced by what is called the *Nāndi*. This *Nāndi*, according to some, must suggest the gist of the whole plot. The *Sūtradhāra* is expected to be a man of no inferior qualifications. He is to be well-versed in light literature, narrative plays and poetry. He should be familiar with dialects and acquainted with the customs of different classes, and the manners of various people. He must be experienced in dramatic details and conversant with the mechanical arts.

The *Sūtradhāra* may sometimes retire after the recitation of the *Nāndi*, in which case another called the *Sthāpaka*, takes his place. In the prelude which may begin with a brief allusion to the poet's literary attainments, his genealogy etc., the *Sūtradhāra* or *Sthāpaka* suggests the subject in the form of a *bīja*, or by a simple beginning or by naming the character about to enter. The *Sūtradhāra* must first please the audience with sweet songs, descriptive of some season and couched in the *Bhārativṛtti*. The *Prasthāvanā* is of two kinds: *Prarocanā* as in the *Ratnāvali* and *āmukha*, in which the *Sūtradhāra* holds conversation with the actress or his assistant bearing on the subject to be introduced.

The prelude over, the piece begins. The whole matter is to be divided into acts and scenes. The *Nāṭaka* may consist of from five to ten acts. The hero should be *Dhīrodātta*. The prevailing sentiment should be *Śṛṅgāra* or *Vīra* and sometimes *Karuṇa*, others being introduced as conducive to its development. Nothing should be introduced in the play, which may have the effect of belittling the hero, or may be discordant with the main sentiment. The act should not be tiresomely long. The poet should employ choice and harmonious terms and the style must be elevated and polished, embellished with the ornaments of rhetoric and rhythm. The act should be in-

troduced by a Viskambhaka where ever possible. Its close is marked with the exit of all characters. Such incidents, as journeys, massacres, war should not be reproduced in a play. They may only be indicated. The death of the hero should never be exhibited. This accounts for the somewhat monotonous character of the Sanskrit drama and the absence of tragedies in Sanskrit. The play should end as it began with a benediction or a prayer called the Bharatavākya, which is repeated by the principal characters and contains an expression of their wish for general prosperity and happiness. The unity of interest or action should be preserved throughout.

The characteristics of the Sanskrit drama are therefore :

1. Its peculiar structure.
2. Absence of distinction between comedy and tragedy.
3. The diversity of language to be spoken by the main characters. In a Sanskrit drama, the hero and other higher male characters speak classical Sanskrit; the Prakrit verses are mostly in Mahārāṣṭri, the heroine and the higher female characters speak Śauraseni, the attendants on the royal persons speak Māgadhī; servants, rajputs and traders speak Ardhamāgadhī; Vidūṣaka speaks Prāci, rogues speak Avantikā, the barbarians speak Apābhraṁśa.

### CHAPTER III KĀLIDĀSA—THE MAN

We know nothing whatever of value and what we may consider as authentic, from later sources, regarding the life and character of Kālidāsa. It is no wonder that there are many traditions surrounding his name. According to one he was born a dunce and later on became a wise and learned poet on account of his propitiation of the Goddess Kālī. It is easy to



trace the source of this theory to the name Kalidāsa. Another tradition ascribes him to the court of King Bhoja, were he was noted for his remarkable skill in the ready manufacture of verses to order, either to describe a given situation or to complete an imperfect stanza. A more circumstantial legend tells us of his murder in Ceylon at the hands of a greedy hetaira while he was a guest of King Kumārādāsa. A more famous tradition makes him one of the nine gems in the court of King Vikramāditya at Ujjayīni.

There is no doubt whatsoever that Kalidāsa, if not born at Ujjayīni, was at least a permanent resident of that place. His love for that city is evident in almost all his works. In the Meghadūta he advises the cloud not to be indifferent to forming an acquaintance with Ujjayīni, though he were to make a detour in his long journey to the North.

The manner in which he refers to this city more than once, and the warmth and the enthusiasm with which he draws a picture of Mahākālā, the Sīprā and other beauties of this City, are a clear indication of the fact that he knew the city and loved it.

वक्रः पन्था यदपि भवतः प्रस्थितस्थोत्तराशाम्  
सौधोत्संगप्रणयविमुखो मा स्म भूरुज्जयिन्याः ॥

Kalidāsa was by faith a Saivite. All dedicatory poems introducing his dramas are addressed to Siva. Kumārasambhavam is written to glorify the great God. He makes Brahmā say

स हि देवः परंज्योतिस्तमः पारे व्यवस्थितम् ।  
परिच्छिन्नप्रभावद्विर्न मया न च विष्णुना ॥

The closing benedictory stanza of the Abhijñāna Śakuntalam

ममापि च क्षयतु नीललोहितः

पुनर्भवं परिगतशक्तिरात्मभूः ॥

seems to be conclusive on this point.

But he was no intolerant sectarian. Raghuvamśa is most pronouncedly in praise of Viṣṇu. In Kumārasambhava canto II, sloka 4, he describes Brahmā as the supreme God; and in Raghuvamśa canto X, sloka 16, he praises Viṣṇu as the highest God; and again in Kumārasambhavam he affirms that all three are the forms of One :

एकैव मूर्तिर्बिम्बिदे त्रिधा सा ।

Kālidāsa was extremely modest. He mentions his name only in the prologue of his plays and never adds to it an epithet of respect or one qualifying word. He was extensively educated. His work bears testimony to his acquaintance with the Purāṇas, the Upaniṣads and the systems of Sāṅkhya Yoga and Vedānta. He had also some knowledge of astronomy and law.

Kālidāsa had travelled widely. He is the only Sanskrit poet who describes the saffron flower which grows in Kashmir. His description of Raghu's conquests prove him intimately acquainted with many Indian scenes: the sandal of Kashmir, the pearl fisheries of Tamraparni, the deodars of the Himalayas, the betel and cocopalms of the Kalinga and the sands of the Indus. His lively description of the long journey of the cloud and his graphic and accurate portrayal of the wonderful Himalayan scenery leads us to the conclusion that he describes what actually he saw.

The various covert references to the name of Vikrama in full eulogistic terms, which are doubtless meant to immortalise King Vikramāditya, show us that he was a denizen of that monarch's court. He also betrays considerable acquaintance



with court life in his works. This circumstance, coupled with the fact that there is no allusion in his writings to the Goddess of Wealth having ever frowned upon him, shows that he was in affluent circumstances, and had not the misfortune ever to drink the bitter cup of poverty.

Unlike Bhavabhūti and many other brother poets, he appears to have enjoyed great popularity during his life time. He was an admirer of field sports and describes their beneficial effects with the exactness of a true sportsman. Though fond of pleasures he was not the unscrupulous voluptuary he is supposed to be by some critics, as is clear from the many noble sentiments expressed in the *Śakuntalā*. It also appears from the same play that he was against love marriages, though always actuated with the most generous sentiments towards the fair sex.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE DATE OF KĀLIDĀSA

Several theories have been put forward regarding the date of Kālidāsa. He has been ascribed to

- (1) the first century B.C.
- (2) the sixth century A.D.
- (3) the reign of Samudragupta.
- (4) the reign of Kumāragupta and Skandagupta.
- (5) the reign of Chandragupta II Vikramāditya.

That he was not later than 634 A.D. is definitely proved by Aihole inscription which reads :

येनायोजि नवेश्मस्थिरमर्थं विवेकिना जिनवेश्म ।

स विजयतां रविकीर्तिः कविताश्रितकालिदास भारवि कीर्तिः ॥

Ray in his remarkable introduction to the *Śakuntalā* summarises the evidence in favour of the theory that Kālidāsa

lived in the first century B. C. The Bhita Medallion which belongs to the Śuṅga period has a scene inscribed in it from the first act of Śakuntalā. If this is genuine then Śakuntalā must have been in existence before that time and hence Kālidāsa should have belonged to the reign of Śuṅga kings. From the absence of artificiality in his style also, he appears to be older than the Girnar and Nasik inscriptions which have been dated to the 2nd century A. D. From the free use of Vedic forms in his writings the poet seems not to have been influenced by Pāṇini's grammar, and to belong to the Post-Pāṇinian period of the transition from Vedic to Sanskrit literature which probably extended from 300 B. C. to 100 B. C. The allusions to Buddhism and its royal patronage in the Śakuntalā place that drama sometime after Aśoka. The consideration of style, taste, etc. show that Kālidāsa is older than Aśvaghoṣa, the Buddhist poet of the first century A. D. The law of inheritance and theft found in the Śakuntalā is also an important piece of evidence. The King decides that the child in the womb of a widow of a rich merchant, who had many other childless widows also, had a right to the property. From this it is clear that in the days of Kālidāsa, a widow was not entitled to inherit the property of her husband. Now we find that Manu, Bodhāyana and Vasiṣṭha do not recognise the widow's right to her husband's property; Nārada and Kātyāyana make provision for her maintenance; while Gautama and Bṛhaspati recognise her share along with the sapinḍas. The date of Bṛhaspati is known to be first century A. D. So Kālidāsa may have flourished before that date. Similarly the fishermen in the Praveśaka of the Sixth act, who is charged with the theft of the ring, is expected by the policemen to secure the punishment of death for his offence. In Vikramorvaśī the king describes the vulture, carrying away the gem, as carrying away his own death. The punishment for theft of a



gem in the time of Manu, Bodhāyana and Vasiṣṭha was death; but in the time of Brhaspati it was either fine or death. This also shows that Kālidāsa must have lived before Brhaspati whose date is fixed at first century A. D.

In Raghuvamśa we find in canto V.

अथोरगाख्यस्य पुरस्य नाथं दीवारिकी देवसरूपमेत्य

Kālidāsa here mentions Uragapur as the capital of the Pāṇḍya country. Rao Bahadur C V. Vaidya argues from this that Uragapur is the same as Uraiur known to be the capital of the Cola kingdom, which had been in a flourishing condition about or before the first century. A. D. The boundaries of the Cola and Pāṇḍya kingdoms have been undergoing constant fluctuations and in Kālidāsa's time Uraiur might have been the capital of the Pāṇḍyas. As early as the first cent. A. D. the capital of the Pāṇḍya country was Madurā. Uraiur is not heard of after the 2nd century A. D. as the capital was transferred to Kāveripattāṇam by king Karikāla. In as much as Kālidāsa knows Uraiur as the flourishing capital of the Pāṇḍyas he must have lived before the first century. A. D.

Fergusson's theory is that Kālidāsa was the contemporary of Yas'odharman, who defeated the Huns at the battle of Karur in 544 A. D. and established a samvat to commemorate his fame and dated it back 600 years. In support of this he cites also the tradition that Kālidāsa flourished in the time of Vikramāditya who had the nine gems to adorn his court. That Vikramāditya did not start any Śaka of his own is proved by the inscription composed by Vatsabhaṭṭi to immortalise the consecration of the temple at Mandassor in the year 529 of the Mālawa era, i.e. 473 A. D. What is known as the Vikrama era was in existence right from 56 B. C. as Mālawa era and was not started in 544 A. D. It was named Vikrama

era only in the 8th century. Again the verses 10 and 11 of the inscription are a clumsy attempt at imitation of the verse II-1 of the Meghadūta, which also proves that Kālidāsa was older than Yas'odharman. Not much importance could be attached to the tradition of the nine gems as the nine gems themselves belong to different centuries, and could never have been contemporaries. Varāhamihira died in 587 A. D. Dhanvantari, who was the author of Dhanvantārinighaṇṭu lived before Amarasiṃha. Amarasiṃha, the author of the famous lexicon, lived in the interval between the visits of the Chinese pilgrims Fa Hian and Hiouen Tshang. His work proves his indebtedness to Kālidāsa. Vararuci, if identified with Kātyāyana, lived in the 3rd or 4th century B.C.

The description of Raghu's conquests lead some to the conclusion that Kālidāsa was a contemporary of Samudragupta and accompanied him on his famous expedition. This is also supported by the tactful reference to the birth of Candragupta in the Raghuvaṃśa.

### इन्दुक्षीरनिधानिव

It has been held by some that Kālidāsa lived under Kumāragupta and Skandagupta, mainly on the score that Mallinātha and Dakṣiṇāvartanātha ascribe to him in the Meghadūta a double entendre referring to Dignāga, the Buddhist logician, as a hostile critic, and that his own reference to the Hūṇas and the river Vāṅkṣu in the Raghuvaṃśa, alludes to the time when these warriors were still in the Oxus valley, just before their defeat by Skandagupta. The first argument is invalidated by the grave improbability of the tasteless reference in the Meghadūta, and by the fact that even if it were real, Dignāga's date need not be later than 400 A. D. The second imputes to Kālidāsa a desire to achieve



historic realism quite out of keeping with his poetic aim and irreconcilable with his mention of the Greeks as on the North-west borders, as well as the Pārasīkas, Kambojas and the Hūṇas.

It is difficult to dissociate Kālidāsa from the great moments of the Gupta power. He was later than Aśvaghoṣa, and the dramatist Bhāsa. He refers to Bhāsa as Prathitaya-śah and calls himself merely a vartamānakavi. He knew Greek terms as his use of Jamitra proves. The prakrit of his drāmas is decidedly later than Aśvaghoṣa's or Bhāsa's. His complete acceptance of the Brahminical system, the sense of sharing in a world of prosperity and power, the mention of horse sacrifice in the Mālavikāgnimitra, Raghu's conquests in the Raghuvamśa, seem best explicable as the outcome of the enjoyment of the protection of a great Gupta ruler. We must also remember that Candragupta II had the title of Vikramāditya, with whose name tradition consistently connects Kālidāsa. Nor is it absurd to see in the title Kumārasambhava a hint at the young Kumārāgupta, the heir apparent, or even in Vikramorvaśī an allusion to the title Vikramāditya.

Considering all these we can definitely say that Kālidāsa lived before A. D. 472 and most probably in the reign of King Candragupta II Vikramāditya in about 400 A. D.

## CHAPTER V

### THE WORKS OF KĀLIDĀSA.

The most authentic of Kālidāsa's works in the probable order of chronology are R̥ṭusam̐bhāra, Meghadūta, Kumārasambhava and Raghuvamśa in the long poems, and Mālavikāgnimitra, Vikramorvaśī and Abhijñāna Śākuntala among dramas. In addition to these there are many other works

ascribed to him but it is doubtful whether he actually composed all or any of these. It must be remembered that many other poets of the same name of Kālidāsa might have existed in India. It is also the practice of many of the minor Sanskrit poets to pass off their creation under the authorship of a more renowned poet. The following are among the works which are traditionally ascribed to Kālidāsa but the authenticity of which is doubtful.

- |                          |                         |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Kuntēśvaradautya.     | 17. Mahāpadyāṣṭaka,     |
| 2. Ambāstava.            | 18. Ratnakos'a.         |
| 3. Kalyāṇāstava.         | 19. Rākśasakāvya.       |
| 4. Kālistotra.           | 20. Lakṣmīstava.        |
| 5. Kāvyanāṭakālāṅkāraḥ.  | 21. Lagustava.          |
| 6. Two Gaṅgāstakas.      | 22. Vidvadvinodakāvya.  |
| 7. Ghāṭakarpara.         | 23. Vṛndāvanakāvya.     |
| 8. Candikādaṇḍakastotra. | 24. Vaidyamanoramā.     |
| 9. Carcāstava.           | 25. S'uddhacandrikā.    |
| 10. Jyotirvidābharāṇa.   | 26. S'rīṅgāratilaka.    |
| 11. Durghāṭakāvya.       | 27. S'rīṅgārarasāṣṭaka. |
| 12. Nalodaya.            | 28. S'rīṅgārasārakāvya. |
| 13. Navaratnamālā.       | 29. S'yāmalādaṇḍaka.    |
| 14. Puspabāṇavilāsa.     | 30. S'rītabodha.        |
| 15. Makarandastava.      | 31. Saptaslokīrāmāyaṇa. |
| 16. Two maṅgalāstakas.   | 32. Setubandha.         |

The Ritusamhāra or a cycle of seasons is a youthful work of Kālidāsa. Beginning with the summer season the poet describes the beauty of the six seasons ending with Spring or the beginning of the new year. The poem is far from a mere description of the seasons in their outward aspect, though Kālidāsa exhibits delicate observation and that loving sympathy with nature, which seems innate in Indian poets. Throughout he insists on the relation of the diverse moods of



the year to the loves of man and maiden; and husband and wife.

In distinction to the *Ritasambhāra*, the *Meghadūta* is unquestionably a work of the poet's maturity. The mere fact that he adopts for it and maintains throughout, a metre so elaborate as the *Mandākrāntā*, is conclusive proof that he was no novice. The subject-matter of the poem is the request of a *Yakṣa* who is separated from his beloved on account of the banishment to the *Rāmagiri* hills in the *Vindhya* mountains by a curse of *Siva*, to a cloud, to bear to his beloved the news of his welfare and the assurance of his devotion. Indian criticism has ranked this poem highest amongst *Kālidāsa's* works for brevity of expression, richness of contents and the power to elicit sentiment.

The *Kumārasambhava* appeals to modern taste more deeply than the *Meghadūta* by reason of its richer variety, the brilliance of its fancy and the greater warmth of its feeling. The subject is unquestionably a daring one, depicting as it does the events which bring about the marriage of the Great *Śiva* to *Umā* and the birth of *Skanda*, the War God. The wedlock of *Śiva* and *Umā* is no mere sport. From this union springs a power destined to slay the demon *Tāraka* who menaces the world with destruction.

Though inferior in some slight degree to the *Kumārasambhava*, the *Raghuvamśa* is rightly ranked as the finest specimen of the *Mahākāvya* as defined by writers on poetics. The poem sketches the history of the dynasty of the Sun born kings beginning with *Dilīpa*, and describing the conquests of *Raghu*, the love of *Aja* and *Indumati*, the life of *Rāma* and *Sītā*, and the descendants of *Rāma* who reigned at *Ayodhyā*.

The *Mālavikāgnimitra* is the first play of *Kālidāsa*. It is a *nāṭaka* of five acts and depicts a love drama on the style of

Bhāsa's plays on the theme of Udayana. The hero is Agni-mitra and the heroine Mālavikā a princess of Vidarbha who had sought refuge at his court in disguise.

The Śakuntalā, the greatest of all Kālidāsa's works, presents the perfection of Kālidāsa's art. It is a Nāṭaka in seven acts according to the rules laid down by the writers on poetics. The play depicts the meeting of Duśyanta and Śakuntalā, their falling in love and secret marriage, the return of Duśyanta to his city, the curse of Durvāsas, the arrival of Śakuntalā at the court of the King, his repudiation of her, owing to the forgetfulness caused by the curse of Durvāsa, the intervention of Menakā, who carries away Śakuntalā to the āśram of Mārīca, discovery of the ring, the pensive life of Duśyanta, his expedition into heaven to help Indra, and the final reunion of the lovers and their son. Kālidāsa excels in this play in depicting the emotions of love, from the first suggestion in an innocent mind to the perfection of passion. He is hardly less expert in pathos. The fourth act of Śakuntalā is a model of tender sorrow, and the loving kindness with which even the trees take farewell of their beloved one contrasts well with the immediate harsh reception of her at the royal court.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE SOURCES OF VIKRAMORVAŚI.

The story of Ūrvas'ī and Purūravas has been very popular in India from the ancient times. The earliest mention of Purūravas is in the first Maṇḍala of the R̥gveda in the fourth verse of the thirtyfirst hymn. The Ninetyfifth hymn in the tenth Maṇḍala gives a dialogue between Purūravas and Ūrvas'ī where the former implores his beloved to return back



to him, and the Gods promise their final union. This dialogue is amplified into a complete story in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. According to it Purūratas fell in love with the celestial nymph Ūrvas'ī, and the latter agreed to come and live with him on the earth on condition that the King will protect her two rams, and that he will never appear naked before her except when they are in bed. The two lovers lived happily for a long time. But the Gandharvas in heaven grew restless because of the absence of Ūrvas'ī, the most beautiful of all the nymphs from their midst. So they resolved on a stratagem to get back Ūrvas'ī to heaven. One night while the King and Ūrvas'ī were in bed they stole away the two rams. Hearing the bleating of the rams as they were carried away, the king rushed out of his bed naked, to see what was the matter. He hoped that the darkness would prevent Ūrvas'ī from seeing his condition. But the Gandharvas immediately caused the lightening to flash and Ūrvas'ī saw the king standing naked before her. Angry at the violation of both her conditions the nymph left the king and returned to heaven. The king grew disconsolate and prayed to the Gandharvas for the restoration of Ūrvas'ī. They at last took pity on him and gave him an urn and said that if he would sacrifice with the help of that urn he would be restored to Ūrvas'ī. But the king left the urn in a forest and returned to his capital. But after a while he grew repentant and went to the place where he had kept the urn; but in its place he saw two trees—the As'vattha and S'amī. He brought back with him some twigs of both these trees and performed sacrifices with their aid. As a result Ūrvas'ī began to visit him regularly every year and six sons were born to her from him.

It is argued from this story that this is an allegory illustrating that Purūratas was the first person to perform sacrific-

ces among Vedic Aryans and Ūrvas'ī is the sacrificial fire that he brought from heaven.

The story in the Viṣṇupurāṇa and Padmapurāṇa is mainly the same with very slight alterations. But in the Kathāsaritsāgar we find a somewhat different story. Purūravas was the son of Budha born of Ilā; and Budha himself was the illicit offspring of Tārā with Candra. Purūravas was a great warrior and a devotee of Viṣṇu. And by Viṣṇu's command Ūrvas'ī was given to him in marriage. One day while he was watching the dance of the nymphs in heaven he burst into derisive laughter when Rambhā made a mistake. Tumburu, the master of ceremonies grew angry and at once cursed him, as a result of which he was separated from Ūrvas'ī. But Viṣṇu intervened and Purūravas was promised the restoration of Ūrvas'ī if he would perform penance at Badrikedar. Purūravas acted accordingly and was united to Ūrvas'ī for ever.

In the Matsyapurāṇa the story is more like the one adopted by Kālidāsa in his play. Considering the doubtful date of these Purāṇas we cannot say whether Kālidāsa borrowed his story from that Purāṇa or the author of the Purāṇa was indebted to the great dramatist.

According to Wilson the story of Purūravas and Ūrvas'ī is an allegory of nature. Purūravas is the Sun and Ūrvas'ī the dawn. At the commencement they are united, but afterwards the dawn leaves him and the Sun has to wander alone over hill, over dale, until towards the evening he is again united with the dawn-this time in the west not to part till death overtakes them in the shape of night.



## CHAPTER VII

## THE PLAY VIKRAMORVAŚĪ.

The play Vikramorvas'ī has come down to us in two recensions, the northern and the southern. In the southern it is called the Nāṭaka which in all essentials it is. In the northern it is called a Troṭaka, which is defined as a dramatic composition relating to incidents partly terrestrial and partly celestial and as consisting of either five, seven, eight, or nine acts with the Vidūṣaka present in every act. Now the Vidūṣaka is absent in Act I and IV of this play. This therefore does not satisfy the condition of the Troṭaka. The Northern recension commented on by Rāṅganātha has a number of Prakrit verses, dancing postures and stage directions referring to them in the fourth act which are not known in the southern. These are clearly later interpolations.

According to the rules laid down by writers on poetics the play opens with a nāṇḍi and a prologue. The prologue is followed by screams of nymphs, and king Purūravas is informed by the terror-stricken nymphs that Ūrvas'ī while on her return from Kailāsa has been abducted by the demon Kes'in. The king hastens to the aid of Ūrvas'ī and recovers her and restores her first to her friends and later on to the Gandharva king Citraratha to be presented to Indra. The king has fallen in love with the nymph and she with him. In the enter'acte a servant of the Queen Auṣinārī extracts cleverly from the Vidūṣaka the reason of the change which has come over the king, namely his love for Ūrvas'ī. In the Second Act, the King declares to Vidūṣaka his love for the nymph, but meets with only scant sympathy. The nymph and her friend appear in the air above, invisible to the King, and Ūrvas'ī drops down a letter written on birch bark,

expressing her love for the king. Purūravas reads it and hands it over to the Vidūṣaka for safe preservation. The friend first, and Ūrvas'ī immediately after her, reveal themselves to the king and after a tender scene between them Ūrvas'ī is recalled to Heaven where she has to take part in a drama composed by Bharata. The letter falls into the hands of Queen Auṣināri, who refuses to be appeased by the King's soothing words. In the enter'acte before Act II we learn from two disciples of Bharata that Ūrvas'ī was so deeply in love with the King, that she played her part badly in the piece on Lakṣmi's wedding; asked whom she loved, she answered Purūravas instead of Puruṣottama; and Bharata cursed her. But Indra intervened and gave her leave to dwell on earth with the king until he had seen the face of her child. The Act that follows shows the king anxious to please the Queen Auṣināri, engaged with her in celebrating the festival of the Moon's union with Robinī. Ūrvas'ī and her friend invisible to the King watch the courteous treatment with which the king treats his wife and which fills the nymph with anguish until assured by her friend that it is not sincere. The Queen Auṣināri in a spirit of self-sacrifice permits the king to marry Ūrvas'ī. Ūrvas'ī then joins Purūravas and their friend leaves them for heaven after exhorting the king to take proper care of the Nymph.

The prelude to Act IV tells us of misfortune. The nymphs Citralekhā and Sahajanyā converse upon the fate that has overtaken the two lovers. Angry with the king and suspecting him of inconstancy, Ūrvas'ī left him to enter the forest of Kumāra and was turned into a creeper on account of a curse left by Pārvati. We find in the fourth act the king seeking for his beloved in distraction, demanding her of the peacock, cuckoo, the flamingo, the bee, the elephant, the antelope, until a voice in the bushes bids him take up the



magic stone which he finds in the cave of a mountain, and with the aid of which he is able to obtain his beloved by grasping a near by creeper.

From this lyric height the drama declines in Act V. The king and his beloved are back in his capital. The magic stone is taken by a vulture, which however, is killed by the arrow of Āyus the son of Ūrvas'ī. The arrow bears the inscription, "the arrow of Āyus, son of Ūrvas'ī and Purūravas". The king had known nothing of the child, but while he is amazed, a woman comes from the hermitage of Cyavana accompanied by a gallant boy, who she reveals to be the son of Purūravas and Ūrvas'ī, entrusted to her care by his mother at the time of his birth. Ūrvas'ī, when summoned, admits of their parentage, but while Purūravas is glad to have found a son, she weeps because she will have to return to heaven now according to Indra's injunction. Purūravas then decides to give up his realm and retire to the forest, but the sage Nārada comes with the good tidings, that Purūravas can enjoy the company of Ūrvas'ī for life if he will help the Gods in the fight that is raging between them and the demons. The play ends with the coronation of Āyus as the heir-apparent.

## CHAPTER VII

### A LITERARY ESTIMATE OF VIKRAMORVAŚĪ.

Vikramorvas'ī is undoubtedly next in rank to the dramatic masterpiece, Abhijñāna Sākuntalam. The plot of the play reveals more of the poet's originality. Every act is a product of the poet's own conception. The story, the situation and the characters are all highly imaginative. The poetry also is attractive and charming. The fourth act, undramatic though it be, is full of a delicate beauty that defies transcription. The ability of Kālidāsa in his choice of appropriate similes is

abundantly seen. Comparisons between the king and the Sun in respect of the nature and period of work; between the missile of Vāyu re-entering automatically into its quiver and a snake coming back into its hole; between the journey of Ūrvas'ī with her friends after the rescue and the return of vernal beauty to the creepers; between Citraratha's descent and a cloud streaked with lightening; between the opening of the eyes of Ūrvas'ī and the opening of the blue lotuses in the morning; between the tearful eyes of Ūrvas'ī and Kandali flowers with reddish lines on their petals and water in the interior; between the king and the leader of the herd of elephants; all these and many more such, reveal the mastery of Kālidāsa in this art.

The beauty of the verses can not easily be matched. The fourth act is a long lyrical monologue. The transformation of Ūrvas'ī into a vine shows great originality. The king wanders disconsolate for his lost darling. He addresses all birds and beasts and even the inanimate objects that he meets. The recurring indifference with which he fancies he is treated by them distresses him. This excites the sympathy of the audience who every moment wish him the discovery of his beloved. The pathos seems to be a little unreal as Purūravas is insane. Nor does it go deep for he dwells more on the forest scenery around him than on the personal relations between them. The theme of the act is entirely a product of the poet's imagination. If the idea was suggested by the wanderings and laments of Rāma similarly situated after Sītā's abduction, it has been immensely improved.

The plot is not completely what we would desire it to be. The second and third acts are long and have little of dramatic action. The incidents are not such as to carry on the movement of the play. The introduction of the Queen, her



resentment and consequent relenting might have been dispensed with, without seriously affecting the dramatic effect. The fifth act looks like an appendage and does not form a natural part of the drama. One would wish the play was closed with the happy reunion of Ūrvas'ī with Purūravas after their release from the form of a creeper.

The play offers an opportunity for charming scenic display. The grouping of the terrified nymphs on the peak of Hemakūṭa; the terrace of the palace bathed in moonlight; the forest through which Purūravas wanders in search of his beloved; the descent of Nārada through the fields of Ether; and lastly the consecration of Āyus as the crown prince by the Nymphs of Heaven; these are scenes which can be reproduced with great beauty.

The story is simple and therefore there is not much display of character. Purūravas is a conventional hero. His character is not much developed. However we know that he is a friend of the Gods, सुरपक्षपाती, and a helper of the distressed, आपन्नानुकम्पी. He is a great warrior सांयुगीनः. He is very modest. He attributes his victory over the demon to the greatness of Indra and thereupon Citraratha remarks अनुत्सेकः खलु विक्रमालङ्कारः.

He shows respect for the Brahmins and ascetics;

अस्व भगवते च्यवनाय मां प्रणिपातय.

Ūrvas'ī though a divine being partakes of the human also. She is too much of a nymph to be a woman, and too much of a woman to be a nymph. At times she behaves in a manner which is peculiar to human beings. When she inquires about the woman, who when prayed to by the king flatters herself, she evokes a gentle rebuke from her friend: किं पुनर्मानुष्यं विडम्ब्यते.

When Urvasī asks how the king desires to go back to his capital, he requests that she should bear him on a cloud made into a balloon. There is a meaning in the request. The poet desires that the audience should not forget that Ūrvas'ī is a celestial being and therefore capable of doing wonderful things.

Ūrvas'ī is not an ordinary courtesan of heaven. She has a superb beauty which casts into the shade all other nymphs. She has a sense of honour not shared by the other individuals of her class. She characterises her first visit to the King as अपहस्तित लज्जो व्यापारः. She is very sincere in her love for Purūravas. In order to prolong her stay with the king she entrusts her child to a hermit woman, thus sacrificing maternal love on the altar of conjugal affection. In her relations with the queen she shows herself much above the common run of women. She bears no jealousy to the queen when the king bids her welcome addressing her as Devi. On the other hand she says स्थाने खल्वियं देवी शब्देनोपचर्यते.

When Ayus is installed as heir apparant, Ūrvas'ī tells him to salute his elder mother. वत्स ज्येष्ठ मातरमभिवन्दस्व. She has a strong attachment to Citralekha to whom she confides all her secrets and entirely depends upon her. त्वमस्यात्मानं दर्शयित्वा यन्मम क्षमं तद्व्रण.



## CHAPTER IX

## THE COMMENTARIES ON VIKRAMORVASHĪ

We know of only two commentators of the *Vikramorvasī*: Kāṭyavema and Rāṅganātha. Kāṭyavema was a minister of a Redgi prince Kamaṇṇagiri of Koṇḍaviḍu about A.D. 1400. In the introductory verses of his commentary on the *Sakuntalā* he tells us something about himself. From that account we know that the commentator's name was only Vema (Bhupāla) and that Kāṭaya was an ancestor of his. His father's name was Kāṭa. He has commented on the three dramas of Kālidāsa. Although he nowhere tells us that he commented on any other work, we know that he commented on the *Amarūsātaka* also.

Kāṭyavema is a sound Sanskrit scholar who has a clear judgment. It is noteworthy that Mr. Pandit with all his critical apparatus could not give us a text more improved than that we have in Kāṭyavema. It is only at two places that the commentator has failed to give us the superior readings adopted by Mr. Pandit. Impressed by the discretion that the commentator exercises in the choice of his readings, Mr. Pandit calls him a careful, scrupulous and exact scholar. His commentary is simple and brief. The language is easy throughout. Unnecessary details are conspicuously absent. The commentary is in all respects suited to the beginners.

Rāṅganātha in the concluding verses of his commentary tells us that he wrote this commentary in Vikrama era 1712 i.e. A.D. 1656. He was a resident of Vyomakesha-puttabhedana. His father's name was Bālakrishna and family name Simbekara.

Rāṅganātha has unfortunately a very bad text to comment on. He constantly fights with his bad readings though

unsuccessfully. Dissatisfied with his interpretations he would propose alternative ones. But in no case would he pronounce his judgment upon a reading. His explanations are also fanciful in some cases, but quite good in others. Ranganātha seems to be well read in rhetoric. But of grammar he betrays a deplorable ignorance. Only once he is noticed to quote a Pāṇinian Sūtra and there it is outrageously misapplied. His language is often ungrammatical.

## CHAPTER X KĀLIDĀSA AS A POET.

Kālidāsa who is hailed as the Shakespeare of India by Sir William Jones has won a great regard for himself both from Eastern as well as Western critics. Of him Bāṇa says.

निर्गतासु न वा कस्य कालिदासस्य सूक्तिषु ।

प्रीतीर्मधुरसाद्रासु मञ्जरीष्विव जायते ॥

Pandit Goverdhanācārya remarks :

साकृतमधुरकोमलविलासिनीकण्ठकूजितप्राये ।

शिक्षासमयेऽपि मुदे रतलीला कालिदासोक्ती ॥

Kumārila quotes with approval the passage from Śakuntalā :

सतां हि संदेहपदेषु वस्तुषु ।

प्रमाणमन्तःकरण प्रवृत्तयः ॥

A subhāṣita has it :

काव्ये नाटकं रम्यं तत्र रम्या शकुन्तला ।

तत्रापि च चतुर्थोऽङ्कस्तत्र श्लोकचतुष्टयम् ॥

And again

पुरा कवीनां गणनाप्रसङ्गे कनिष्ठिकाधिष्ठितकालिदासा ।

अद्यापितत्तुल्य कवेरभावादानामिका सार्धतन्वी नभूव ॥



Among the western critics Goethe said, on reading  
Śakuntalā:

"Wouldst thou the young year's blossom and the fruit of  
its decline,

And all by which the soul is charmed, enraptured, feasted,  
fed.

Wouldst thou the heaven and earth itself in one sole  
name combine?

I name thee, O Śakuntalā and all at once is said." According to Humboldt Kālidāsa is a masterly describer of the influence which nature exercises upon the minds of lovers. Tenderness in the expression of feelings and richness of creative fancy have assigned to him a lofty place among the poets of all nations. Schlegel gives him a high place among the sons of song while Lassen calls him the bright star in the firmament of Indian poetry. Of him Sir Monier Williams says in his appreciation of Śakuntalā—"No composition of Kālidāsa displays more the richness of his poetical genius, the exuberance of his imagination; the warmth and play of his fancy; his profound knowledge of the human heart; his delicate appreciation of its most refined and tender emotions; his familiarity with the workings of its conflicting feelings, in short more entitled him to the rank of Shakespeare of India."

In Kālidāsa we have unquestionably the finest master of Indian poetic style, superior to Aśvaghōṣa by the perfection and polish of his work, and all but completely free from the extravagances which disfigure the later great writers on Kāvya. Dandī ascribes to his favourite style, the Vaidarbhi, qualities which may fairly sum up as firmness and evenness of sound, avoiding harsh transitions and preferring gentle harmonies; the use of words in their ordinary sense and clearness of

meaning; the power to convey sentiments; beauty, elevation and the employment of metaphorical expressions.

अनभ्रवृष्टिः श्रवणामृतस्य सरस्वतीविभ्रमजन्मभूमिः ।

वैदर्भीरीतिः कृतिनामुदेति सौभाग्यलाभप्रतीभूः पदानाम् ॥

He assures longevity to a poem which in addition to conforming to the rules of the Mahākāvya is rich in ornaments and Kālidāsa is not sparing in his use of these means of adding grace to his work. But he has the fundamental merit of preferring suggestion to elaboration. His successors too often thought that they could only prove their capacity by showing all of what it was capable. He was content to produce a definite effect, and to leave well alone. His was the golden mean between rustic simplicity and over refinement.

The structure of each of Kālidāsa's verses is simple. Throughout it is normal to have each verse complete in itself, a single verb serving to support a number of adjectives and appositions, though relative clauses with verb expressed or implied are not rare. The compounds are normally restricted in length, but this is less closely observed in the Mandākrāntā metre though even then clearness is aimed at and normally achieved. The order of the words is sometimes irregular partly no doubt by reason of metrical necessity. Besides ordinary forms of alliteration we find the more important yamaka in which the same syllables are repeated in the same or inverted order, but with different sense.

Of figures of sense Kālidāsa excels in the simile :

उपमा कालिदासस्य भारवेरर्थगौरवम् ।

दण्डिनः उपमाखिल्येन भारवेः सन्ति त्रयो गुणः ॥



The Indian love of simile appears freely in the R̥gveda and is attested by the elaborate sub-division of Indian poetics. The width of Kālidāsa's knowledge and the depth of his observation of nature and life are here shown to the highest advantage.

The style of Kālidāsa is as simple as that of Bhāsa and the author of the M̥rchakaṭikā, but with an elegance and refinement which are not found in these two poets. Aśvaghōṣa might have influenced his style but the chief cause of its perfection must have been natural taste and constant reworking of what he had written, a fact which may easily explain the discrepancies between the recensions of his works. But the skill in the Śākuntalā never leads him into the defect of taste which betrayed his successors into exhibiting their skill in the wrong place. Skilled as he is in description and ready as he is to exhibit his power, in the fifth act of the Śākuntalā he refrains from inserting any of these ornamental stanzas which add nothing to the action, however much honour they may do to the skill of the poet. His language has also the merit of suggestiveness. What Bhavabhūti, the greatest of his successors, expresses at length, he is content to indicate by a touch. He is admirably clear and the propriety of his style is equally admirable. The language of the policeman and the fisherman is as delicately nuanced as that of the domestic priest who argues at once in the best style of his philosophical sutras. The prakrit which he ascribes to the maidens of his plays has the supreme merit that it eschews elaborate constructions and long compounds such as Bhavabhūti places without thought of the utter incongruity in the mouths of simple girls.

Above all things Kālidāsa is a poet of the human heart. His delineation of the delicate feelings in men and women in different state are perfectly realistic. He excels in depicting the sentiment of love and no other poet in any land has sung

of the happy love between man and woman as well as he Kālidāsa is also a poet of nature. He finds beauty in things great as well as small. He is equally at home in a palace and a wilderness. But what distinguishes him most from the other poets is the art with which he welds human emotion in his descriptions of nature.

Kālidāsa has a trick of saying pithy things which have become proverbial in their nature :

1. महदपि परदुःखं शीतलं सम्यगाहुः
2. विभावितैकदेशेन देयं यदभियुज्यते
3. स्वार्थात्सतां गुरुतरा प्रणयिक्रियैव
4. भनिर्वेदप्राप्याणि श्रेयांसि
5. परिभवास्पदं दशाविपर्ययः

The rhetoricians extol the merits of Kālidāsa in metaphor and they repeatedly cite his skill in the use of figures of speech sound and thought, which they divide and sub-divide in endless variety. He excels in vivid description :

अग्रे स्त्रीनखपाटलं कुरवकं श्यामं द्वयोर्भागयो-

बांलाशोकमुपोढ रागसुभगं भेदोन्मुखं तिष्ठति ।

ईषद्वद्वरजः कणाग्रकपिशा चूते नवा मञ्जरी

मुग्धत्वस्य च यौवनस्य च सखे मध्ये मधुश्रीः स्थिता ॥

There is pathos in Purūravas's reproach to Ūrvaśī :

त्वयि निबद्धरतेः प्रियवादिनः प्रणयभङ्गपराङ्मुखचेतसः ।

कमपराधलवं मम पश्यसि त्यजसि मानिनि दासजनं यतः ॥

His vain efforts to attain his beloved are depicted forcibly :

समर्थये यत्प्रथमं प्रियां प्रति क्षणेऽपि तस्मै परिचरितव्यम् ।

अतो विनिद्रं सहसा विलोचने करोमि न स्पर्शं विभावितप्रियः ॥



There is no limit to the strength of his love :

अयं तस्यां रथक्षोभादंसेनांसो निपीडितः ।

एकः कृती शरीरेस्मिन् शेषमङ्गं भुवोभरः ॥

Even hyperbole is permissible :

सामन्तमौलिमणिरञ्जितशासनाङ्गमेकातपत्रमवनेन तथा प्रभुत्वम्

अस्याः सखे चरणयोरहमद्यकान्तमाज्ञाकरत्वमधिगम्य यथा कृतार्थः ॥

The recovery of the nymph from her faint caused by the savage onslaught upon her is described in a happy series of similes :

आविर्भूते शशिनि तमसा मुच्यमानेव रात्रि

नैशस्यार्चिर्हुतभुज इव च्छिक्षभूयिष्ठधूमा ।

मोहेनान्तर्वरतनुरियं लक्ष्यते मुक्तकल्पा

गङ्गारोघः पतनकलुषा गृण्हतीव प्रसादम् ॥

## CHAPTER XI

### KĀLIDĀSA AND BHĀSA.

There is *prima facie* the probability that Kālidāsa should be affected by a predecessor so illustrious and of such varied achievement as Bhāsa and the probability is turned into certainty by the numerous coincidences between the two writers. Inevitably of course with such a genius as Kālidāsa's the matter which is borrowed is transformed and normally improved in the change and this fact renders strict proof of indebtedness impossible. But the evidence is sufficient to induce conviction to any one accustomed to weighing literary evidence of borrowing.

In Act I of the Śakuntalā, the King is struck with the elegance of the simple bark dress worn by the heroine in keeping with her station as a maiden of the hermitage :

किमिव हि मधुराणां मण्डनं नाकृतीनाम्

The germ of this pretty idea is found in the *Pratimānātaka* Act I where *Sītā* playfully decks herself in a dress of bark evoking the judgment of her friend :

सच्चसोहणीयं सुरुवं नाम

The converse relationship is here incredible. *Bhāsa's* imitation of *Kālidāsa* would be feeble and tasteless while *Kālidāsa's* improvement on his original is apt and skilful. The fact of borrowing is established by the episode in the same act of the *Śakuntalā* of the treatment of watering the garden as an act of penance on the maiden's part; an idea which occurs in a closely parallel passage in Act V of the *Pratimānātaka*. *Bhāsa* treats it as bearable illustrating it up by the adduction of an example in the technical form of an *Arthāntharanyāsa* while *Kālidāsa* is more severe in his condemnation using the technical figure *Nidarśana*, clearly a deliberate variation of the idea. In the same act of the *Pratimānātaka* we find *Rāma* bidding *Sītā* take farewell of the fawns and the trees which are her foster-children and of her dear friends the *Vindhya* mountains and the creepers. In the Act IV of the *Śakuntalā* the trees and the fawns as well as the creepers share in grief of her departure to the King's capital. *Kālidāsa* also uses the term foster-child used in the *Pratimānātaka*. Again in Act VII of the *Pratimānātaka*, *Sītā* is reminded of the distrust felt by the deer in *Bharata* just as *Śakuntalā* describes their distrust of *Duśyanta*. There is a parallel in the *Śvapnavāsavadattā* Act I where *Vāsavadattā* is received kindly by the lady of the hermitage and thanks her for her courteous words, to the scene at the opening of the *Śakuntalā* in which the King assures *Sītā* that her speech of welcome is sufficient hospitality. The parallel is completed by the



instruction given by the Chamberlain in Bhāsa's play to the servant to avoid disturbance to the hermitage, with the commands of the King to the commander-in-chief in S'akuntalā. Similar also is the scene in Act II of the Svapnavāsavadattā in which during the play of Padmāvatī and Vāsavadattā in disguise, reference is made to the former's approaching marriage, to the talk of S'akuntalā's friends with her in Act I. We have also in the sixth act of either play a parallel treatment of the lute lost by Udayana in the one case and the ring lost by S'akuntalā in the other. The verses in which these innocent objects of censure are attacked are similar in spirit and taste.

Other traces of Bhāsa's influence are also to be found. The motif of the curse of Durvāsa which in the S'akuntalā explained the sufferings of the heroine suggests the curse of Candabhārgava in the Avimāraka which reduces the hero to a humble rank and in the S'akuntalā the lovers are reunited at the hermitage of the sage Mārīca as in the Avimāraka they meet at the home of Nārada. There is a vague similarity also as regards many expressions in the two poets, but it would be unwise to lay any special stress on such testimony. But the more specific evidence given above of dependence is undeniable. And it is surprising to find it questioned by Professor Hillebrandt especially when we have Kālidāsa's own recognition of Bhāsa's fame and Bāṇa's reiteration of it.

The most valid argument which might be adduced against dependence is the fact that Kālidāsa's dramas as they stand do not seem to agree with the rule observed in those of Bhāsa regarding the beginning of the drama. In Bhāsa's works the Sūtradhāra appears on the stage at the close of a Nandī the text of which is not given and recites a verse which obviously is not technically a Nandī though it is of the same

type containing a benediction. In the works of Kālidāsa the first verse is the Nāndi, and at the close of it the Sūtradhāra begins the play with a dialogue. But we cannot rely on the manuscripts as giving us the true practice of Kālidāsa's date for we know that in the case of the Vikramorvaśī old manuscripts denied to the first verse the character of a Nāndi and therefore presented the play in the form affected by Bhāsa and the same style is sometimes followed in the South Indian manuscripts of other plays. It is, therefore, impossible to hold that Kālidāsa rejected the practice of Bhāsa or base any arguments on the facts.

## CHAPTER XII

### KALIDĀSĀ AND BHAVABHŪTI.

The only dramatic poet that can be compared with Kālidāsa is Bhavabhūti and although on the whole as a poet, the former ranks much higher than the latter, as a dramatist the latter certainly disputes the palm with the former on a much stronger ground. The tide of opinion among the Pandits once ran so high in favour of acknowledging Bhavabhūti with his drama the Uttararāmacarita as a superior playwright. These two poets are justly regarded as the leading dramatists in Sanskrit. Both are original in their ideas and methods of treatment and are gifted with a genius of a very high order. Both are masters of the natural style of poetry and both are equally happy in their choice of words. It is true that Bhavabhūti's style is rather more elaborate and in a few places marked by long compounds. But in that the poet was unconsciously yielding to the tendency of his age. If Kālidāsa has more fancy and imagination Bhavabhūti is more sentimental and passionate. Kālidāsa excels in depicting the sentiment of love while Bhavabhūti is in his element when



depicting the sentiment of pathos and heroism. Neither however is much inferior to the other in depicting what may be called the other's forte. The former suggests or indicates the sentiment which the latter expresses in forcible language. In the language of Sanskrit critics Kālidāsa conveys the Rasa by the lakṣya or vyañgya sense of words while Bhavabhūti conveys it by the vācya sense. Kālidāsa's may be described as the synthetical method of poetry while Bhavabhūti's as analytical. When Duṣyanta sees Śakuntala after love has wounded his heart he simply says :

अये लब्धं नेत्रनिर्वाणम्

Whereas Bhavabhūti in Mālatimādhava in a similar occurrence :

अविरलमिव दाम्ना पौण्डरीकेण नद्धः

स्नपित इव च दुग्धस्रोतसा निर्भरेण ।

कवलित इव कृत्स्नश्चक्षुषा स्फारितेन

प्रसभममृतमेवेनेव सान्द्रेण सिक्तः ॥

Here the feeling is the same but the different forms of it are forcibly described.

Compare the scene between Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā when left alone with each other, and what Mādhava says when Mālati embraces him in the disguise of her friend Lavañgikā :

एकीकृतस्वचिनिषिक्त इवावपीडय

निर्भुङ्गपीनकुचकुञ्जलया नया मे ।

कर्पूरहारहरिचन्दनचन्द्रकान्त

निष्यन्दशैवलमृणालहिमादिवर्गः ॥

Also and as an instance of Bhavabhūti's forcible style the first effect produced on Mādhava on his seeing Mālati :

परिच्छेदातीतः सकलवचनानामविषयः

पुनर्जन्मन्यस्मिन्ननुभवपथं यो न गतवान् ।

विवेकप्रध्वंसादुपचितमहामोहगहनो

विकारः कोऽप्यन्तर्जडयति च तापं च कुरुते ॥

Compare the meeting of Duṣyanta with Śakuntalā, with that of Mādhava and Mālātī. Mādhava says in Act VIII

जीवयन्निवसमूढसाध्वसस्वेदबिन्दुरधिकण्ठमर्प्यताम् ।

बाहुरैन्दवमयूखचुम्बितस्यन्दिचन्द्रमणिहारविभ्रमः ॥

and

दग्धं चिराय मलयानिल चन्द्रपादै-

निर्वाचितं तु परिरभ्य वपुर्न नाम ।

आमत्तकोकिलस्तव्यथितातुहया-

मद्यः श्रुतिः पिबतु किन्नरकण्ठि वाचम् ॥

It may be that Bhavabhūti has modelled the love of Mādhava and Mālātī on that of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā. But the love of Mādhava is more ethereal than that of Duṣyanta and perhaps Bhavabhūti as a poet is more ethereal than Kālidāsa. Bhavabhūti's delineation of the sentiment of pathos is simply unparalleled.

कारुण्यं भवभूतिरेव तनुते

As a poet of nature and as a describer of picturesque he is not inferior to Kālidāsa. The plays of Kālidāsa on the whole do not much aim at giving a realistic picture of the life of the society of his time; Bhavabhūti's do. The characters of Kālidāsa are more romantic and idealistic in their conception; those of Bhavabhūti more realistic and varied.



## CHAPTER XIII

## THE METRE IN VIKRAMORVAŚĪ.

Kālidāsa is a great metrist. There are one hundred and twenty five verses in the Vikramorvaśī composed in twenty one different metres. They are as under :

1. *The Anuṣṭubh or the Śloka* : The rules for the śloka are

- (1) the verse consists of four pādas of eight syllables each ;
- (2) the seventh syllable is long in the odd pāda and short in the even ;
- (3) the fifth syllable in each pāda is always short and the sixth always long ;
- (4) the pādas should not commence with either dactylus or tribrachys.

The following twenty eight verses in the Vikramorvaśī are in this metre : Act I. 12, 13, 14 ; Act II. 4, 5, 15, 17, 19 ; Act III. 9, 11, 18, 21, Act IV. 9, 14, 17, 18, 19, 21, 27, 31, 40 ; Act V. 1, 3, 7, 12, 14, 20, 23, 24.

2. *Indravajrā* : The metre consists of four pādas with eleven syllables in each pāda the caesura being after the fifth syllable. The scheme of the verse is :

— — U — — ' U U — U — —

Only one verse, Act IV 35 is in this metre.

3. *Dr̥ṭavilambita* : This is a metre consisting of 12 syllables the scheme being :

U U U — U U — U U — U —

Only four verses in the Vikramorvaśī are in this metre : Act II 9 ; Act III 6 ; Act IV 26, 29.

4. *Vams'astha*: This is a metre with twelve syllables in the pāda the scheme being:

U — U — — U U — U — U —

There are seven verses of this type in the *Vikramorvaśī*: Act I 5, 9; Act III 12, 13; Act IV 7, 37, 39.

5. *Mañjubhāṣinī*: This is a metre with thirteen syllables in the pāda the scheme being:

U U — U — ' U U U — U — U —

Only two verses are in this metre: Act IV 33 and 43.

6. *Vasantatilaka*: In this metre there are fourteen syllables in the pāda the scheme being:

— — U — U U U — U U — U — —

There are twelve verses of this class in the *Vikramorvaśī*: Act I 3; Act II 14, 16; Act III 19, 20; Act IV 6, 11, 15; Act V 9, 14, 16, 19.

7. *Mālini*: In this metre there are fifteen syllables in the pāda the caesura coming after the eighth syllable. The scheme is:

U U U U U U — — ' — U — — U — —

There are six verses of this type in this play: Act II 6; Act IV 10, 13, 22, Act V 21, 22.

8. *Mandākrāntā*: This is one of the favourite metres of Kālidāsa and he has used it throughout the length of *Megha-dūta*. It has seventeen syllables in the Pāda the caesura coming after the fourth and the tenth syllables. The scheme is:

— — — — ' U U U U U — ' — U — — U — —

In the *Vikramorvaśī* there are only four verses in this metre: Act I 7; Act II 1; Act III 1; Act IV 4.



9. *Pythvī*. This metre also contains seventeen syllables in the pāda the caesura coming after the sixth and twelfth syllables. The scheme is

U — U U U — ' U — U U U — ' U — — U —

Only one verse Act II 11 is in this metre.

10. *Sikharinī*: This is also a metre of seventeen syllables in the pāda the caesura occurring after the sixth syllable. The scheme is:

U — — — — — ' U U U U U — — U U U —

Only two verses are in this metre: Act IV 28, 34.

11. *Harinī*: This is another metre of seventeen syllables in the Pāda the caesura occurring after the sixth and tenth syllables:

U U U U U — ' — — — — ' U — U U — U —

Four verses are of this type: Act II 10; Act III 10 Act IV 1,20; Act V 18.

12. *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*: This is a metre having nineteen syllables in the pāda the caesura occurring after the twelfth syllable.

The scheme is:

— — — U U — U — U U U — ' — — U — — U —

There are eleven verses of this class in the Vikramorvaśī Act I 1,4,8; Act II 7,20,23; Act III 2,15; Act IV 2,25,38.

13. *Aparavaktram*: This is a metre of the Arddhasama class the scheme being:

U U U U U U — U — U —

U U U U — U U — U — U —

U U U U U U — U — U —

U U U U — U U — U — U —

Only one verse Act II 22 is of this type.

14. *Puspitāgrā* : This is also a metre of the Ardhasama class the scheme being :

U U U U U U — U — U — —  
 U U U U — U U — U — U — —  
 U U U U U U — U — U — —  
 U U U U — U U — U — U — —

Only two verses are of this type : Act III 3,22.

15. *Mālyabhārā* : This again is a third metre of the Ardhasama class the scheme being :

U U — U U — U — U — —  
 U U — — U U — U — U — —  
 U U — U U — U — U — —  
 U U — — U U — U — U — —

Five verses in the Vikramorvasi belong to this class : Act I 15, 16, Act II 18, Act IV 3,16.

16. *Upajāti* (*Māyā*) : This metre is formed by the combination of the *Indravajrā* and the *Upendravajrā* metres, the scheme being ;

— — U — — U U — U — —  
 U — U — — U U — U — —  
 U — U — — U U — U — —  
 — — U — — U U — U — —

Only one verse Act I 18 is of this type.

17. *Upajāti* (*Ārdra*) : The scheme of this type of *Upajāti* is

U — U — — U U — U — —  
 — — U — — U U — U — —  
 — — U — — U U — U — —  
 U — U — — U U — U — —

Two verses are of this type Act I 17 ; Act V 6.



18. *Upajāti* (*Viparītapūrvā* or *Hamsī*) : The scheme of this type of *Upajāti* is :

U — U — — U U — U — —  
 — — U — — U U — U — —  
 U — U — — U U — U — —  
 — — U — — U U — U — —

Only one verse Act V 2 belongs to this class.

19. *Āryā* : This consists of four *pādas* the first *pāda* containing twelve breves, the second eighteen, third twelve and fourth fifteen. The *āryā* is divided into hemistichs each hemistich containing seven feet and one long syllable. In the first hemistich the sixth foot shall be either an amphibrach or a foot of four short syllables and the last letter shall always be long. In the second hemistich the sixth foot will be only of one short syllable, the seventh a regular foot of four breves and the last one long letter as in the first hemistich. The even feet in the *Āryā* must be one of the following: dactylus, amphibrach, anapaestus, spondee and four breves. The odd feet in either hemistichs should never be amphibrachs. There are thirty one *āryās* in the *Vikrāmorvas'ī* : Act I 2, 6, 10, 11; Act II 2, 3, 8, 12, 13, III 21: Act 4, 5, 8, 14, 16, 17; Act IV 5, 8, 23, 24, 30, 32, 36, 41, 42; Act V 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13.

20. *Vaitālīyam* : This is a stanza of four *pādas* the odd *pāda* containing fourteen breves and the even sixteen. The odd *pādas* begin with six syllabic instants and are followed by a creticus and an iamb. In the even *pādas* the beginning consists of eight syllabic instants and are concluded by a creticus and an iamb. The syllabic instants in the even *pādas* are not all short or all long and the even syllabic instant in each *pāda* is not formed conjointly with the next

Only one verse Act IV 12 of this type occurs in the Vikramorvaśī.

21. *Aupacchandasikam*: This is the same as *Vaitāliya* except that at the end of each pāda there must be a creticus and a bacchius instead of a creticus and an iamb. That is we get an *aupacchandasikam* by adding a long syllable at the end of each pāda of a *vaitāliya*. Act .III 7 is the only verse of this type in the *Vikramorvaśī*.